

REMARKS

The specification has been amended to correct a typographical error. Claims 1, 3, 8, 29 and 30 have been amended. Claim 2 has been newly canceled. Claims 12-19 have been allowed.

In ¶ 2 of the office action, the specification has been objected to for not providing support for the limitation "said first layer is not external to any other layer" recited in claims 2 and 29. The Applicants submit this ground for objection has been overcome by the deletion of the foregoing limitation from those claims.

In ¶ 3 of the office action, claims 2 and 29 were rejected for the reasons set forth in the objection to the specification. This ground of rejection has also been overcome by the aforementioned amendments to claims 2 and 29.

In ¶ 5 of the office action, claims 2, 29 and 30 were rejected as being indefinite. In particular, in claim 30, the phrase "said odor-eliminating agent" lacks proper antecedent basis. As applied to claim 30, this ground of rejection has been overcome by amending claim 30 to depend from claim 2, not claim 12. Claims 2 and 29 were rejected again for the inclusion of the limitation "not external to any other layer", which

limitation, as previously noted, has been deleted from those claims.

In ¶ 7 of the office action, claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,531,197 to Neteler. The Applicants traverse this ground of rejection for the following reasons.

Amended claim 1 now recites a receptacle made of a laminated material comprising a web of gas-permeable thermoplastic material, a web of gas-impermeable thermoplastic material, and an odor-eliminating chemical agent supported by the web of gas-permeable thermoplastic material, the web of gas-impermeable thermoplastic material being external to and in contact with the web of gas-permeable thermoplastic material, and the inner surface of the web of gas-permeable thermoplastic material being exposed to the interior volume of the receptacle.

In contrast, the Neteler patent discloses a container having a wall consisting of three layers: a durable outer layer, a moisture barrier intermediate layer, and a desiccant-containing inner layer. In the disclosed embodiment, the inner layer is microporous polyolefin impregnated with silica, the intermediate layer is a metal foil, and the outer layer is either polyester terephthalate, nylon, lacquer or

polypropylene. Neteler states (col. 3, lines 32-33) that the durable outer layer provides a gas barrier. Due to the intermediate metal foil, the gas-impermeable outer web is not in contact with the inner web having a surface exposed to the interior volume of the receptacle, which structure is recited in Applicants' amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by Neteler.

In the alternative, claims 1, 2 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Neteler in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,861,632 to Caggiano. In particular, the Examiner asserts that, even if Neteler does not disclose an odor-eliminating chemical agent, it would have been obvious to incorporate such an agent in view of the teaching of Caggiano. The Applicants traverse this ground of rejection for the following reasons.

In Caggiano, the moisture absorbent layer is sandwiched between a water-permeable inner layer and a water-impermeable outer layer, i.e., the inner layer does not support the moisture absorbent agent. Therefore, neither Neteler nor Caggiano disclose a web of gas-impermeable thermoplastic material external to and in contact with a web of gas-permeable thermoplastic material, the inner surface of

the web of gas-permeable thermoplastic material being exposed to the interior volume of the receptacle, as recited in Applicants' claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 2 are not unpatentable over Neteler in view of Caggiano.

In ¶ 8 of the office action, claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over the references as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,803,090 to Castiglione et al. The Applicants traverse this ground of rejection for the same reasons, set forth above, that claim 1 is neither anticipated by Neteler nor unpatentable over Neteler in view of Caggiano, and for the following additional reasons.

Castiglione discloses a fluid transport tape that is designed to be adhered to a surface, e.g., of an airplane component. For the case wherein the surface is metallic. Castiglione discloses that "a corrosion inhibiting agent may be included in the adhesive compositions associated with the fluid transport tape". The Applicants respectfully submit that it would not be obvious to incorporate the adhesive composition (with corrosion inhibiting agent) in the bag of Neteler since the adhesive layers 26 and 28 of Neteler would not contact the electronic components stored therein. Since

the adhesive layers of Neteler would not contact any components susceptible to corrosion stored therein, the addition of corrosion inhibiting agent to the adhesive would serve no purpose and would not be obvious.

In ¶ 9 of the office action, claims 9-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over the references as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Official Notice and Worthy, Jr. (2003/0236159). The Applicants traverse this ground of rejection for the same reasons, set forth above, that claim 1 is neither anticipated by Neteler nor unpatentable over Neteler in view of Caggiano.

Finally, in ¶ 10 of the office action, claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Neteler in view of Castiglione. The Applicants traverse this ground of rejection for the same reasons, set forth above, that claim 3 is not unpatentable over Neteler in view of Castiglione.


Claim 30 has been amended to depend from claim 1 and to recite that the majority of the odor-eliminating agent is disposed on the inner surface of the web of gas-permeable thermoplastic feature. This feature is not disclosed in either Neteler or Caggiano.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants submit that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and allowance of claims 1, 2, 8-19, 29 and 30 are hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

April 11, 2007

Date


Dennis M. Flaherty
Reg. No. 31,159
Ostrager Chong Flaherty &
Broitman P.C.
570 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10022-6894
Tel. No.: 212-681-0600

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date set forth below.

April 11, 2007

Date


Dennis M. Flaherty